REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated October 23,2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 3 and 5-6 were pending in the Office Action with claim 1 being in independent form. By the present Amendment new claims 7 and 8 have been added.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0106647 to Koshiishi et al. (hereinafter "Koshiishi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,483 to Harada et al. (hereinafter "Harada"). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner contends that Koshiishi substantially discloses all of the features of claim 1 of the present application. The Examiner concedes that Koshiishi does not disclose that the insulation layer has a thickness in the range of 20 micrometers to 500 micrometers, however, contends that Harada discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Koshiishi does not disclose a susceptor device that includes "an inner electrode which is disposed on the second main surface of the ceramic base body," and "an insulating sprayed layer, formed by a sprayed ceramic, which covers the inner electrode, a connecting section of the inner electrode and the electricity supplying terminal," as is required by claim 1 of the present application.

The Examiner argues that the main body 11 of Koshiishi corresponds to the "ceramic base body" of claim 1, and that Koshiishi discloses an inner electrode as well, but makes no indication of which element of Koshiishi corresponds to this feature. The Examiner further argues that paragraph 0031 of Koshiishi discloses an insulating sprayed layer while element 14b of Koshiishi corresponds to a bonding agent layer of claim 1. This is clearly incorrect.

The main body 11 of Koshiishi supports the wafer (W) on a top surface thereof. First and second dielectric films 14a and 14b are sprayed on the top surface of the body 11 to form an electrostatic chuck that electrostatically chucks the wafer W. The dielectric layers may be made of mixtures of materials that can be changed to alter resistance thereof. When a voltage is applied to the main body 11, the dielectric films are electrostatically charged to provide an attracting force for the wafer W. Thus, in Koshiishi, the dielectric layers 14a and 14b act as the

inner electrode of the present invention to provide the electrostatic force to hold the wafer in place. Thus, the dielectric layer 14b is not a bonding agent layer, as was argued by the Examiner. Further, since the dielectric layers 14a and 14b form the electrostatic chuck, neither of these layers correspond to the "insulating sprayed layer" of claim 1. Further, these dielectric layers 14a, 14b are sprayed directly onto the base 11 of Koshiishi. Thus, even if they were insulating sprayed layers, which they are clearly not, Koshiishi does not disclose any "bonding agent layer" that attaches the insulating sprayed layer to the temperature controlling section, as is also required by claim 1 of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 6,677,167 to Kanno et al. (hereinafter "Kanno") in view of Harada. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner contends that Kanno substantially discloses all of the features of claim 1 of the present application. The Examiner concedes that Kanno does not disclose that the insulation layer has a thickness in the range of 20 micrometers to 500 micrometers, however, contends that Harada discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner argues that the wafer stage (52/77) of Kanno corresponds to the "ceramic base body" of claim 1, and that Kanno discloses an inner electrode 34. The Examiner further argues that the layer 79 of Kanno corresponds to the insulating spray layer of claim 1. The Examiner further makes reference to paragraph 0038 of Kanno as disclosing a temperature control part and contends that the insulating layer and the temperature control part are attached by a bonding layer 14b. This is clearly incorrect.

The wafer stage 77 of Fig. 13, for example, includes a stepped region 78. An insulation layer 79 is also provided and an internal electrode 34 is provided on the insulating layer. The Examiner has referred to paragraph 0038 of Kanno as allegedly disclosing temperature adjustment mechanisms, however, there is no paragraph 0038 in the Kanno reference. The Examiner further refers to a bonding agent layer 14b in Kanno, however, no such reference numeral appears to be present in Kanno. Applicant presumes that the Examiner mistakenly

utilized the reference numerals from the Koshiishi reference discussed above in reference to the Kanno reference. If this is incorrect, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specify which features of Kanno she intended to identify. Nevertheless, it is clear that Kanno does not disclose a susceptor in which "the insulating sprayed layer and the temperature controlling section are attached via a bonding agent layer." In Kanno, the insulting layer 79 is positioned directly on top of the wafer body 77. There is no disclosure in Kanno of a "bonding agent layer," as required in claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, is patentable over the additional cited art, for at least the reasons described above.

New claim 7 specifies that the first main surface of the ceramic base body is seamless. This feature is clearly illustrated in Fig. 1, for example, of the present application. In contrast, in Koshiishi there is a seam between the focus ring 12 and the wafer chuck 11. Further, in Kanno, there is a seam between the wafer stage 52 and the susceptor 28. That is, the top surface of the body in these references is not seamless. Thus, it is believed that claim 7 is patentable over the cited art for this reason as well.

New independent claim 8 is similar to independent claim 1 except that it specifies that the first main surface of the ceramic base body is seamless . Thus, it is believed that new claim 8 is also patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

In light of the remarks and amendments made herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 and 5-8 are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM ON MARCH 23, 2007

Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:KJB/jl